

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

(Placer)

----

In re RACHELLE L., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

PLACER COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ANGELA F.,

Defendant and Appellant.

C042421

(Super. Ct. No. 53-000364)

Angela F., mother of the minor, in propria persona appeals from orders of the juvenile court terminating her parental rights. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26 [further undesignated statutory references are to this code].) Appellant attempts to raise various contentions. We affirm.

FACTS

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) removed the month-old minor from appellant's custody in July 2001 as a result of a domestic violence incident, appellant's mental health

issues, and alcohol abuse. The minor's half sibling had been detained in 1999 and later adopted when reunification efforts failed. DHHS recommended no services be provided to appellant because she had not made reasonable efforts to treat the problems which led to the removal and adoption of her other child.

(§ 361.5, subd. (b)(10).) The court found the minor came within the provisions of section 300 and denied services to appellant but ordered services for the minor's father.

Because the father was unable to reunify within six months, the court terminated services and set a section 366.26 hearing. During and after the reunification period, appellant sporadically visited the minor. Appellant missed some visits because she was in jail. Initially, appellant did not interact significantly with the minor or show much affection when she did visit. Over time, as the minor grew, appellant became more comfortable with her but never really bonded with the minor or developed a maternal relationship toward her.

At the section 366.26 hearing, appellant entered a general objection to termination of her parental rights but presented no evidence to support any exception to termination or to challenge the social worker's report which concluded the minor was likely to be adopted. The court terminated parental rights and ordered the minor placed for adoption.

#### DISCUSSION

In a somewhat unfocused opening brief, appellant discusses several issues relating to findings and orders entered long

before the court ordered termination of parental rights, i.e., wrongful detention, unsupported jurisdictional findings, denial of services, relative placement considerations, denial of her request for a judge to hear the case, visitation issues, lack of reasonable efforts to keep the minor in the home, and matters relating to the dependency case of the minor's half sibling who was adopted prior to the commencement of this matter. Appellant has waived consideration of any of these issues for failure to assert her challenges in a timely fashion either in the juvenile court or on appeal. (*John F. v. Superior Court* (1996) 43 Cal.App.4th 400, 404-405; *In re Christopher B.* (1996) 43 Cal.App.4th 551, 558.)

To the extent appellant's discourse may be construed to challenge the juvenile court's finding the minor was likely to be adopted or to assert an exception to the preference for adoption (§ 366.26, subd. (c)(1)(A)), again the issues are waived for failure to raise them in the juvenile court. (*In re Christopher B.*, *supra*, 43 Cal.App.4th at p. 558.)

In any case, the evidence fully supports the juvenile court's findings and orders. The record is clear that the minor was highly adoptable despite some physical problems and hypersensitivity, both of which were responding to treatment and a stable home. Further, there was no evidence of any significant parent-child bond and thus no benefit to the minor of maintaining contact with appellant. (*In re Autumn H.* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th, 567, 575; *In re Beatrice M.* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1411, 1418-1419.)

DISPOSITION

The orders of the juvenile court are affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBIE, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
SCOTLAND, P.J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DAVIS, J.